

7. (three times amended) The display unit as claimed in claim 2, [further comprising] wherein the dial plate comprises an optical waveguide [in contact with the dial plate] which abuts an edge of the display; and

C3

sub wherein the front panel of the display is connected to the optical waveguide so as to form a single component.

C2

11. (three times amended) The display unit as claimed in claim [4]3, wherein the front [pole] polarizing filter of the liquid crystal screen is connected to the dial plate film so as to form a single component, and there is as empty space behind the front [pole] polarizing filter.

CPB

REMARKS

In the IDS filed March 8, 1999 the foreign references were noted as to their relevance by pointing to certain Figs. or other portions listed on page 3 of the Search Report (also noting the sentence bridging pages 1-2 of the IDS and lines 3-4 of page 2 thereof), so no further comment is believed required for their consideration which is respectfully requested. Applicants note that the Japan Abstracts and the US patent all in English were considered, appreciation for which is highly expressed.

In the Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for reasons set forth in the Office Action. Claims 1, 6, and 9 were rejected

4323951
5803433
5915822

under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Suzuki et al (US 5,741,058), and claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al for reasons set forth in the Office Action.

Reconsideration of these rejections is requested respectfully in view of the amendment and the argument herein.

With respect to Point 2 of the Office Action, it is noted that the German priority document (page 4, line 14) employs the term "Polfilter" which is translated in the present specification (page 3, line 25) as "pole filter". The Examiner refers to polarizers used in the construction of a liquid crystal display (LCD) device. It is believed that the German "Polfilter" is intended to mean "polarizing filter" (or polarizer) and, accordingly, this term has been introduced by this amendment into the specification and the claims in accordance with the idiomatic usage of English.

In point 3 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner is believed to be in error to the extent that there are also liquid crystal displays with only one polarization filter. This is the case, for example, with reflectively operated displays which have a front polarization filter through which incident light striking the display passes and is polarized, subsequently passes through the liquid crystal substance and is reflected at a rear mirror - in a fashion maintaining the direction of polarization - and passes through the front polarization filter a second time after once more passing through the liquid crystal substance. However, the polarization filter specified in the present application (for example claim 3) is in any case the front polarization filter of

362/23

a liquid crystal display. Therefore it is intended that the claim language be understood to include both forms of construction of LCD.

The claims, as understood are believed to clearly set forth the invention, thereby to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112.

With respect to the rejections based on 35 USC 102 and 103, the following argument, in conjunction with the amending of the claims, is believed to overcome the rejections so as to secure allowance of the claims.

Suzuki et al does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 1 of the present application. It is nowhere possible for the essential feature of the independent claim 1 of the present patent application to be gathered from Suzuki et al, in accordance with which the front side of the display is arranged in one plane with the front side of the dial. Rather, in accordance with Suzuki et al, (compare, for example, Figures 2, 3) a display device is provided with a cover plate 40, and a dial 30 arranged on the rear side of the cover plate 40.

For example, the LED lens elements 20A, 20B (Fig. 2) are located in a space (which the Examiner likens to an optical waveguide) behind the cover lens 40. The optional LCD (column 14 at line 65) presumably would occupy the same space. This arrangement would contradict the feature of the present invention wherein, as shown in present Fig. 2, the front surface of the display and the dial plate coincide. It is noted also that an LED display does not have the laminar construction of an LCD display so that the

teaching of Suzuki et al does not relate to the present invention. A liquid crystal display which is possibly additionally present (corresponding to column 14, lines 62-65) is only arranged behind the cover plate 40 and dial 30 as seen by a viewer. The inventive feature of the present patent application therefore cannot be gathered at any point in Suzuki et al.

Various ones of the claims have been amended to emphasize features of the construction of the present invention to facilitate a distinguishing of the invention from the cited art. In Suzuki et al, the passage in column 14 (line 65) referred to by the Examiner provides no description of the LCD in reference to the components of the dial and the plate having the dial thereon. While this might be a significant reference with respect to a claim having no detail in the description of the relationship between display and dial plate, the amended claims de recite sufficient detail so that this reference cannot be considered as providing material which would anticipate or suggest the arrangement in the present inventive structure of the front panel and polarizer of the LCD and the dial plate which, in itself, is constructed as a light guide, and which seamlessly abuts the LCD with a continuous front surface of film and polarizer.


Accordingly, this amendment and argument are believed to have overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 102 and 103 so as to secure allowance of the claims.

Since the present claims set forth the present invention patentably and distinctly, and are not taught by the cited art

either taken alone or in combination, this amendment is believed to place this case in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the matter, enter this amendment, and to allow all of the claims in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Brandt, et al

by: 
MARTIN A. FARBER
Attorney for Applicants
Registered Representative
Registration No. 22,345

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR SECTION 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that the accompanying Amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on May 10, 2000.

Dated: May 10, 2000


MARTIN A. FARBER

866 United Nations Plaza
Suite 473
New York, NY 10017
(212) 758-2878